

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 and 47-48 are pending in this Application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 6, and 21-22 have been amended, and new claims 47-48 have been added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **I. Formal Matters**

The Office Action rejects claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §101 alleging that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants traverse this rejection, as follows.

Regarding claim 33, the Office Action states that “the claim is directed to a signal directly or indirectly by claiming *a computer usable medium* and the Specification . . . recites evidence where the medium is defined as a ‘signals’ . . . In that event, the claim is directed to a form of energy which at present the office feels does not fall within at least one of the four enumerated categories of patentable subject matter recited in section 101” (see Office Action, pages 2-3).

It is respectfully submitted that claim 33 does not recite or mention a “signal.” Claim 33 is directed to a “computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having control logic stored therein for causing a computer to provide interactive assistance with populating an automated document.” It is improper to import claim limitations from the specification. See M.P.E.P. section 2111.01. “Though understanding the claim language may be aided by explanations contained in the written description, it is important not to import into a claim limitations that are not part of the claim. For example, a particular embodiment appearing in the written description

may not be read into the claim when the claim language is broader than the embodiment.” See *Superguide Corp. v. DirectTV Enterprises, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Furthermore, although the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held that a “signal, standing alone” is not patentable subject matter, the court was careful to distinguish claims directed to “a storage medium holding the resulting signals,” which were allowed by the PTO. See *In re Petrus A.C.M. Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 33, directed to a “computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having control logic stored therein for causing a computer to provide interactive assistance with populating an automated document,” which is an article of manufacture, contains patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

## **II. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roper (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,351) in view of Cornelius (U.S. Patent No. 7,069,234). To the extent that these rejections remain applicable to the claims, as amended, the Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, as follows.

The Applicants submit that Roper and Cornelius, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for providing interactive assistance with populating an automated document that includes at least one field, the method including at least performing a compliance check of each response for the at least one

field to determine if the response complies with predetermined legal requirements, as recited in amended claim 1.

As acknowledged on page 5 of the Office Action, Roper fails to disclose or suggest at least performing a compliance check for each response for the at least one field, as recited in amended claim 1.

Cornelius fails to make up for the deficiencies of Roper. In particular, Cornelius, as cited by the Examiner, discloses that compliance checking is performed through data validation on defined parameters of structured formats for text (col. 23, lines 32-33). Cornelius, however, fails to disclose at least performing a compliance check of each response to determine if the response complies with predetermined legal requirements, as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Cornelius, in combination with Roper, as cited by the Examiner, fails to disclose or suggest at least the combination of features recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 2-20, which depend from allowable claim 1, are likewise allowable over the cited references, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For similar reasons to those discussed with regard to allowable claim 1, the Applicants submit that amended claims 21-22 and 33 are allowable over the cited references. As amended claims 21-22 and 33 are allowable over the cited references, the Applicants submit that claims 23-32 and 47-48, which depend from allowable claims 21-22 and 23, respectively, are likewise allowable.


**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-33 and 47-48 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 026063-00014.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bogdan A. Zinchenko  
Registration Number 57,473

Customer Number 004372  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: 202-857-6000  
Fax: 202-638-4810

BAZ/hs